

## REMARKS

Claims 1-29 were pending in the present application. Applicant amends Claims 1, 3, 14, and 25-29 to clarify claimed subject matter and/or correct informalities. The original specification and drawings support these claim amendments at least at pages 24-26 and Figures 3 and 6. Therefore, these revisions introduce no new matter. Applicant cancels Claims 10-13 and 15 without prejudice.

**Claims 1-9, 14, and 16-29** are for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. Applicant requests favorable consideration of this response and allowance of the subject application based on the following remarks.

### Previous Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112, §102 and §103

Applicant appreciates Examiner's withdrawal of the 35 USC §112, §102 and §103 rejections of the previous Office Action.

### Statement of Telephone Conversation

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's participation in a telephonic conference of April 10, 2007. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for responding to questions along the lines of those set forth below in the section entitled "Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §101". Specifically, Applicant discussed how the subject matter in the application contains language such as "computer storage media", found in the original specification on pages 24 to 26.

In the interest of expediting prosecution of the application, and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicant proposed to amend Claims 25-29 to further clarify features of Applicant's claimed subject matter. Applicant understands that the Examiner

tentatively agrees that the proposed amendments, “computer storage media”, overcome the outstanding rejections based on §101. Applicant is submitting the amendments in writing in this Response to the Office Action.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

**A. Claims 10 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (Office Action, page 12).** Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that these claims are allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant amends independent **Claims 1 and 14** to recite features formerly recited in dependent Claims 10 and 15, respectively. The amendments to independent Claims 1 and 14 are purely of form (i.e., dependent format to independent format), and are not to overcome prior art or any other objections. Accordingly, dependent Claims 10 and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicant submits that independent Claims 1 and 14 are in allowable form and are in condition for allowance.

**B. Claims 21-24 are allowed (Office Action, page 12).** Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that Claims 21-24 are allowed. Applicant appreciates the Examiner for expediting the prosecution of this application. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 21-24 are in condition for allowance.

**Claim Objections**

The Office objects to Claims 1 and 3 providing suggestions on how to amend the claims. Accordingly, Applicant amends the claims based on the Office's suggestions.

**Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §101**

**Claims 11-13 and 25-29** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant cancels **Claim 11-13**, rendering moot the rejection of these claims.

Applicant amends **Claims 25-29** to recite "computer storage media". In particular, support is shown below from page 25, line 1 to line 11 of the original specification.

By way of example, and not limitation, computer-readable media may **comprise computer storage media** and communication media. "**Computer storage media**" includes volatile and nonvolatile, removable and non-removable media implemented in any method or technology for storage of information such as computer-readable instructions, data structures, program modules, or other data. Computer storage media includes, but is not limited to, RAM, ROM, EEPROM, flash memory or other memory technology, CD-ROM, digital versatile disks (DVD) or other optical disk storage, magnetic cassettes, magnetic tape, magnetic disk storage or other magnetic storage devices, or any other medium which can be used to store the desired information and which can be accessed by computer

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's assistance with amending these claims to overcome the §101 rejections. These claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. §101 and as a result, the rejection is now moot. Applicant respectfully submits Claims 25-29 are in condition for allowance.

**Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102**

**Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, and 11-13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,781,961 to Gunsay. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent Claim 1**, to clarify further features of the subject matter along the lines of allowable dependent Claim 10. Accordingly, Claim 10 has been cancelled without prejudice. Amended **Claim 1** now recites:

A method implemented at least in part by a machine, the method comprising:

receiving an input that includes hierarchical data;

traversing a filter tree according to segments of the hierarchical data to locate one or more matching nodes that correspond to the hierarchical data;

comparing at least a portion of the input to one or more filters tree associated with the matching nodes; and

executing instructions associated with one or more filters tree satisfied by the input;

wherein the traversing further comprises:

comparing a first segment of the hierarchical data with a first node in a filter tree level that corresponds with a position of the first segment in the hierarchical data;

if the first segment does not match the first node, determining that the input does not match the first node;

if the first segment matches the first node and there is a subsequent second segment in the input, comparing the subsequent second segment to one or more second nodes in the filter tree that are subordinate to the first node; and

if the first segment matches the first node and there is not a subsequent second segment in the input, determining that the input matches the first node.

Applicant submits that independent Claim 1 is in allowable form and in condition for allowance.

**Dependent Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8** depend from Claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for the additional features that they recite that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are not disclosed by Gunsay.

Applicant cancels Claims 11-13 without prejudice, so these rejections are now moot.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

**A. Claims 4, 7, 9, 14, and 16-20** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0220909 to Brown in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,781,961 to Gunsay. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Dependent Claims 4, 7, and 9** depend directly from amended independent **Claim 1**. As mentioned previously, Claim 1 recites features of the subject matter along the lines of allowable dependent Claim 10. Therefore, **Dependent Claims 4, 7, and 9** are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are neither shown nor suggested by Brown or Gunsay, either singly or in combination with one another.

**Independent Claim 14** has been amended to recite features formerly recited in allowable dependent Claim 15. Thus, Claim 14 is in allowable form and in condition for allowance.

**Dependent Claims 16-20** depend directly from independent **Claim 14**, which has allowable subject matter. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in Claim 14, are neither shown nor suggested by

Brown or Gunsay, either singly or in combination with one another. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejections.

**Conclusion**

**Claims 1-9, 14, and 16-29** are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500  
Spokane, WA 99201

Dated: 4-12-2007

By: Shirley Lee Anderson

Shirley Lee Anderson  
Reg. No. 57763  
(509) 324-9256 ext. 258